

1 Charles A. Bonner, Esq. (SBN: 85413)
2 A. Cabral Bonner, Esq. (SBN: 247528)
LAW OFFICES OF CHARLES A. BONNER
3 1913 Bridgeway
Sausalito, CA 94965
4 Telephone: (415) 331-3070
Facsimile: (415) 331-2738

5
6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
MELVIN ATKINS

7 Kimberly E. Colwell, Esq. (SBN: 127604)
8 kcolwell@meyersnave.com
9 Tricia L. Hynes, Esq. (SBN: 212550)
thynes@meyersnave.com
10 MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON
11 555 12th Street, Suite 1500
Oakland, CA 94607
Telephone: (510) 808-2000
Facsimile: (510) 444-1108

12 Attorneys for Defendants
13 CITY OF PETALUMA and
OFFICER PAUL ACCORNERO

14
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

17 MELVIN ATKINS,

Case No: C07-05524 SI

18 Plaintiff,

19 v.
20 **JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT**
21 **CONFERENCE STATEMENT**

22 CITY OF PETALUMA; PETALUMA POLICE
23 DEPARTMENT; OFFICER PAUL
ACCORNERO; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

24 Defendants.
25
26
27
28
DATE: May 14, 2008
TIME: 2:30 a.m.
DEPT: Courtroom 10, 19th Floor
JUDGE: Hon. Susan Illston

Complaint Filed: September 14, 2007
Trial Date: February 9, 2009

1 The parties to the above-entitled case jointly submit their Updated Case Management
 2 Statement and request that the Court adopt this statement in issuing its case management order.

3 1. Jurisdiction & Service. This is a civil rights case, under 42 USC 1983, seeking damages,
 4 for violation of the plaintiff's constitutional rights, thus jurisdiction is proper based upon 28 USC
 5 §1441(b) based upon federal question. All parties have been served.

6 2. Facts:

7 A. Plaintiff's Facts:

8 The On December 19, 2006, at approximately 6:25 a.m., Plaintiff MELVIN ATKINS
 9 (hereinafter 'MR. ATKINS') was riding a bicycle down the street across from the local Sheriff
 10 Department Station in Marin City. As MR. ATKINS rode past, a Petaluma Police Department
 11 officer (DEFENDANT ACCONERO) was taking his K-9 attack dog, a Belgian Malinois named
 12 Roy, from the back of a patrol car. The dog saw MR. ATKINS and bolted towards him as if to
 13 attack. Startled, knowing that police K-9s are highly trained attack dogs, MR. ATKINS hit his
 14 brakes hard, causing him to fly forward over the handle bars and into the air.

15 As the dog approached, MR. ATKINS heard Defendant ACCORNERO give the dog a
 16 "NO!" command. MR. ATKINS hit the ground hard with a thud. Dazed, MR. ATKINS could feel
 17 the dog biting him in several different spots on his body. After the attack, MR. ATKINS could feel
 18 DEFENDANT ACCORNERO trying to place himself between MR. ATKINS and the dog, while
 19 continuing to give the dog the "NO!" command. As MR. ATKINS lay on the ground, he could see
 20 DEFENDANT ACCORNERO physically carrying the dog away in his arms and continuing to give
 21 the "NO!" command as the dog continued to bark

22 After the attack, MR. ATKINS went to the emergency room at Marin General Hospital.
 23 Subsequently he made several visits to the Marin City Clinic and has received treatment from a
 24 therapist regarding the incident.

25 B. Defendants' Facts:

26 On December 19, 2006, at 6 a.m., Officer Paul Accornero was with his K-9 dog, Roy,
 27 when Mr. Atkins came riding down the middle of the street on a bike. Officer Accornero heard Mr.
 28 Atkins jam on his breaks and saw Mr. Atkins fall. Roy went over to Mr. Atkins, who was wearing

1 layers of puffy jackets like the K-9 trainers wear, and Roy put his jaw around Mr. Atkins' elbow.
2 Officer Accornero immediately gained control of the dog. Roy did not break through Mr. Atkins'
3 skin at all and Mr. Atkins admitted he was fine, but as he was about to leave, an individual came
4 over to the two men and repeatedly told Mr. Atkins that he should sue the City. Subsequently, Mr.
5 Atkins did.

6 3. Legal Issues:

- 7 a. Whether Mr. Atkins was injured?
- 8 b. Whether any of Mr. Atkins' rights were violated?
- 9 c. Whether Officer Accornero and the City are entitled to qualified immunity?

10 4. Motions: Defendants may bring a summary judgment motion based upon qualified
11 immunity.

12 5. Amendment of Pleadings: N/A.

13 6. Evidence Preservation: Defendants have notified all relevant departments to maintain and
14 preserve anything related to this Action.

15 7. Disclosures: The parties will exchange their Disclosures prior to this Conference.

16 8. Discovery: The parties have agreed to hold off on depositions and exchanging written
17 discovery until after attending an early settlement conference, provided the parties make their Rule
18 26 disclosures.

19 9. Class Actions: N/A.

20 10. Related Cases: N/A.

21 11. Relief: Plaintiff has suffered and continues suffer physical and emotional injuries as a result
22 of the attack. Plaintiff seeks to recover for his out of pocket economic losses for medical and
23 mental health expenses and other economic losses. Additionally plaintiff seeks recovery for his
24 non-economic damages.

25 12. Settlement and ADR: The parties have a further settlement conference scheduled on May 2,
26 2008 before Magistrate Judge Zimmerman.

27 13. Consent to Magistrate Judge For All Purposes: Defendants previously declined to proceed
28 before a Magistrate Judge.

1 14. Other References: N/A.

2 15. Narrowing of Issues: Unknown at this time.

3 16. Expedited Schedule: N/A.

4 17. Scheduling: Each party may take all depositions agreed to by code or as agreed to between
5 parties; Each Party shall be entitled to propound written discovery; Each party may propound
6 unlimited requests for production of documents or things; Each party may propound unlimited
7 request for admissions; Fact discovery cutoff on **September 12, 2008**; Expert disclosures and
8 reports by **October 3, 2008**; Expert rebuttal reports **October 17, 2008**; Expert dispositions to be
9 completed by **October 30, 2008**; Last day of hearing on motions **November 7, 2008**; The parties
10 agree to meet and confer concerning any modifications to this plan.

11 18. Trial: Plaintiff requests jury trial; defendants reserve. Estimated length of trial is 3 days.
12 Trial set for: **February 9, 2009**; Pre-trial conference set for: **January 26, 2009**; Mandatory pre-
13 trial settlement conference set for: **February 2, 2009**.

14 19. Disclosure of Non-Party Interested Entities or Persons: The parties will separately file their
15 "Certification of Interested Entities or Persons." Defendants are presently unaware of any other
16 interested parties.

17 20. Any Other Matters: N/A.

18 Dated: April 25, 2008

LAW OFFICES OF CHARLES A. BONNER

20
21 By: _____ /s/
22 Cabral Bonner
23 Attorneys for Plaintiff
24 MELVIN ATKINS

25 Dated: April 25, 2008

26 MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON

27
28 By: _____ /s/
29 Tricia L. Hynes
30 Attorneys for Defendants
31 CITY OF PETALUMA and
32 OFFICER PAUL ACCORNERO

1088541_1